

**I. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-3, 11-13 and 21-23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Griesemer (U.S. Patent No. 6,385,660). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection at least because Griesemer does not disclose the claim limitation of “based on the determined type ascertaining whether the received input object satisfies one or more predefined requirements.”

Claim 1 recites “determining a type of the received input object.” The Examiner asserts that Griesemer’s disclosure of verifying that the received object is of the saved predicted receiver type 505 (of class A) teaches this aspect of claim 1. See page 2, para. 3 of Office Action.

Claim 1 further recites “based on the determined type, ascertaining whether the received input object satisfies one or more predefined requirements.” The Examiner asserts that Griesemer’s disclosure that a prolog portion 455 of a method 453 (see Fig. 8) “checks if the object x is of the saved receiver type,” and in the example shown the stored receiver type is a class A object, teaches this limitation of claim 1. The Examiner appears to take the position that determining whether object x is of class A teaches “ascertaining whether the received input object satisfies one or more predefined requirements.” However, the determination of whether object x is of class A has already been cited by the Examiner for teaching the “determining a type of the received input object” language of claim 1. Consequently, the rejection is deficient since the same aspect of the Griesemer reference is cited for teaching two different elements of the claimed invention.

Further, it is respectfully submitted that determining the class to which an object belongs does not teach “ascertaining whether the received input object satisfies one or more *predefined*

*requirements.*" In particular, an object x is not required to belong to a class A, since class A is merely one of many classes (i.e. class B, class C) to which object x can belong. Therefore, the mere fact that an object can belong to a particular class, does not constitute a predefined requirement as recited in claim 1.

For at least the above reasons, claim 1 and its dependent claims should be deemed patentable. Since claims 11 and 21 recite similar elements, claims 11 and 21 and their dependent claims should be deemed patentable for at least the same reasons.

**II. Rejection of claims 4-6, 14-16 and 24-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 4-6, 14-16 and 24-26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Griesemer in view of Allen (U.S. Patent No. 6,658,625). Claims 4-6, 14-16 and 24-26 should be deemed patentable by virtue of their dependency to claims 1, 11 and 21 for at least the reasons set forth above. Moreover, Allen does not cure the deficiencies of Griesemer.

**III. Rejection of claims 7-8, 17-18 and 27-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 7-8, 17-18 and 27-28 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Griesemer in view of Yokote (U.S. Patent No. 6,138,140). Claims 7-8, 17-18 and 27-28 should be deemed patentable by virtue of their dependency to claims 1, 11 and 21 for at least the reasons set forth above. Moreover, Yokote does not cure the deficiencies of Griesemer.

**IV. Rejection of claims 9, 19 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 9, 19 and 29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Griesemer in view of Yokote and further in view of Aditham (U.S. Patent No. 6,378,001). Claims 9, 19 and 29 should be deemed patentable by virtue of their dependency to claims 1, 11

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116  
Appln. No.: 09/364,370

Attorney Docket No.: A8494

and 21 for at least the reasons set forth above. Moreover, neither Yokote nor Aditham cure the deficiencies of Griesemer.

**V. Rejection of claims 10, 20 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 10, 20 and 30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Griesemer in view of Yokote and further in view of Nakai (U.S. Patent No. 6,253,248).

Claims 10, 20 and 30 should be deemed patentable by virtue of their dependency to claims 1, 11 and 21 for at least the reasons set forth above. Moreover, neither Yokote nor Nakai cure the deficiencies of Griesemer.

**VI. Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Ruthleen E. Uy  
Registration No. 51,361

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE  
23373  
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: November 8, 2004